

To Be Attacked By A Cyber-Space Troll!

©2019 by Mark Richards

My family and I found ourselves in an unenviable position this winter, as the Fake News pundits set some English cyber bully into full attack mode in our direction. He opened his attack with a series of interviews with some questionably one-sided 'witnesses'.

It provides an interesting lesson in how the New World Order attacks and destroys people that it considers a threat, and opens up a number of questions concerning how the public needs to react to clean up this growingly dangerous situation.

Every year, innocent people go to prison (or are pushed to suicide) because of 'informants', who lie for their own self interests. The problem, studies show, is the fact that this horse trading between the informants and the government - or the media - is largely informal, unregulated, and highly secretive. On top of that, the informants hold all the cards, because they supposedly have valuable information the government wants - no matter if it is true or not.

This motivates some prosecutors or reporters to bend whatever rules there are to get what they want. It becomes even more of a danger when 'good people' are convinced to tell only 'part' of the truth, thus seeming to add weight to the prosecutor or reporters version of the story, while avoiding the facts that might have proven the chosen targets defense. This must change. There has to be meaningful transparency with the government's - or the media's - use of "incentivized witnesses." There must be some way to validate the information offered by an incentivized witness who has every reason to game the system, because the system in place is deeply flawed.

What convicts call 'snitches' or 'rats' have been around for a long time. A good example is that the American Civil War saw tens of thousands of war prisoners "flipping" in order to gain better treatment by their captors. Some of them gave up information on their friend's and their war plans, while others switched allegiance to the side of their captors. Legal commentators say this proves that harsh treatment of prisoners promotes the prisoner's innate desire to appeal to authorities in power over them to gain more favorable treatment.

Not much has changed in that respect.

The U.S. government's use of informants became a formal part of law enforcement during the Prohibition era in the 1920s, when the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms switched to using entrapment and informants to catch gun and alcohol smugglers, making snitching an integral part of the criminal justice system. Informant use exploded, however, in the 1970s, when President Richard Nixon declared a "war on drugs," and the government used the same techniques of entrapment and informants to bust suspected drug offenders on a massive scale. Ronald Reagan ramped up the war on drugs by creating harsh mandatory minimum sentences for drug offenders, which could be avoided only if the defendants cooperated with the government by snitching on their confederates. The government's targets weren't drug kingpins, but low-level grunts who would flip and give law enforcement information on the higher ups in the organization. Faced sometimes with mandatory life in prison, these low-rung players were forced into a situation where they had no choice but to cooperate, even if it meant they had to make up stories.

Informants have become the "tool of choice," for law enforcement and the media, especially in conspiracy cases where 'proof' can be rather thin. While facts and figures are closely guarded secrets, the limited data that is publically available about informants show that about 60 percent of drug defendants cooperate in some way in exchange for reduced charges or sentences.

"Often, in DEA [Drug Enforcement Administration], you have agents who do little or no follow up" in drug cases, one prosecutor complained. "So when a cooperator comes and begins to give you information outside of the particular incident, you have no clue if what he says is true," he said. "It's bizarre," another admitted.¹

A major problem is that informants offer information that law enforcement or the media often cannot verify as true. When an informant testifies for the government before a jury or for the media 'on camera', the specific details are usually known only to the informant, which gives the appearance that the informant has "inside information." This bolsters the informant's credibility with those listening, and proving that the informant's information is false is nearly an impossible feat for a defendant.

Government witnesses lying on the stand is nothing new, but it is how and why they lie that has changed. Loyola Law School professor Alexandra Natapoff said in her study, How Snitches Contribute to Wrongful Convictions, that prosecutors are heavily invested in the informant's story to make their case and thus have no real incentive to check a lying informant. The same is true for the average media reporter, pushing for higher ratings far more than the 'truth'. This "marriage of convenience" created by the interests of the prosecutor and informant benefits both parties, with an innocent person sometimes going to prison (or being destroyed in the media).

Natapoff also would note that police and prosecutors and reporters become heavily invested in their informants' stories and often lack the objectivity needed to step back and see when their sources might be lying. They begin to believe the lies themselves.

Studies also have shown that false testimony by witnesses cause more wrongful convictions than the next two leading causes - erroneous eyewitness identification and false or coerced confessions - combined.

In a study by the University of Alabama psychology department, mock jurors were unable to detect the coercive nature of confession testimony, and more importantly, they gave undue weight to an informant's confession testimony in determining guilt. The study's authors concluded that "if jurors cannot perceive the difference between an honest and dishonest cooperating witness there is grave potential for such testimony to lead to wrongful convictions of the innocent." In stating the obvious, the researchers observed that this creates a "substantial problem for the criminal justice system."

When an informant's testimony is the sole evidence to support a conviction or an accusation, "the integrity of the system is at stake," Natapoff warned. She observed that the U.S. Supreme Court in *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993), placed a requirement on the courts to evaluate the reliability of expert witnesses because they can be "both powerful and quite misleading." However, there is no such requirement for an incentivized witness testifying about unsubstantiated facts on behalf of the government or some media pundit.

One might remember that an incentivized witness is someone who testifies on behalf of the government or any source of information against another person or group in exchange for an

expected benefit. This benefit may include favorable treatment in the person's own criminal case, money, protection against the threat of being attacked themselves, or other goods or considerations. This can include so called "Good Samaritans," who come forward on their own with information about someone being accused of wrong-doing for no other reason than the public recognition of being one of the voices who helped 'put that guy away.'

The term "incentivized" means "a motivation or reason for doing something." Incentives offered to government witnesses have included reduced sentences, cash, a chance to spare friends or family from criminal charges, an early parole, or any other deal the government offers for the witness' testimony. The term "witness," also referred to as "informant" in this context, means someone who provides information or testimony in exchange for an incentive. Though not limited to only criminal suspects, by far the most common government informant is the "jailhouse informant," who is a person facing criminal charges or serving a prison sentence who wants a reduced sentence or charges dropped in exchange for his information against a fellow prisoner. The State of Alaska, for example, defines "informant" as "someone who provides evidence against someone else for money or to escape or reduce punishment for [their] own misdeeds or crimes." The labels "incentivized witness" and "informant" are often used interchangeably.²

The testimony offered by an incentivized witness about what a defendant said or admitted to is called a "secondary confession," which is defined as "evidence provided by someone other than the suspect and purported to be direct information from the suspect." It is this secondary confession that's the product the informant sells and for which the government - or the reporter - barters.

Amazingly, the government knows just how perverse this practice is. "Informants are not the most reliable people around," Orange County, California, District Attorney Tony Rackauckas told 60 Minutes. When the host asked Rackauckas about a particular informant popular with his office, he said, "I think you should assume you're talking to an informant. And if he's talking, he's probably lying." Prosecutors know that the product they are buying has defects. So do reporters and other media pundits. The problem is, as long as it helps to prove their side of a case or story, they don't care.

To Be Attacked By A Cyber-Space Troll - Part II!

@2019 by Mark Richards

In the last chapter of this diatribe, I expressed how my family and I have found ourselves in the unenviable position of becoming targets for the Fake News pundits, and some fanatic English cyber bully. The cyber thug opened his attack with a series of interviews with some questionably one-sided 'witnesses', that attacked us with accusations and twisted truths based more on mistakes and deliberate lies than any sort of evidence - apparently a standard for this sort of cultural molestation.

The new generation of low-life Sirens seem to be seeking to solve their lack of ability to 'debate' by simply calling the rest of us names and disturbing titles. The problem is that their tactic works, as the general public isn't always aware enough to question the wildly nasty accusations or accept the idea that not everything you may hear or read in the Media is true. The more emotionally crazed the accusatory attack, the more the public is willing to go along with the threatening words being thrown around, rather than looking deeper into the motives and agenda of those making the loudest noise.

One may realize that Yellow Journalism has been out there for over a century, and we have only to look at any of the propaganda from either of the World Wars to see how well it works. But to any rational person it comes as a real shock when they find themselves as the targets of such attacks. Many have started to wonder if our civilization can survive this new age of cultureless, discourteous, harsh, impolite, tempestuous, fear mongers; seeing the negative force of such foul minds overwhelming everything from free speech to all other basic human rights and 'truths'.

What I teach the men in my Debate Group in prison is to never lower ourselves to that name-calling level. When our opponents emphasize their emotional and intellectual inferiority by trying to reduce the debate to name-calling and 'fear tactics', we must be even more inflexible in our professionalism. The only things that can save us - or our cause - when a 'louder' opponent attacks, is our positive

character, spirit, and calmly superior methods. If we can re-establish ourselves as the only real professional in the conversation - distinguished from the rude amateur - then the profane and enraged aggressor slowly is silenced by the weight of weakness within their own negative energy. As one professor assured me years ago; "No fool wins forever."

Already mentioned in my last writing on this subject were the general concepts of the use of witnesses who have something to gain by their contrived testimony, and the reason that someone would perform such an attack on myself and my supporters. These ideas will be enlarged on in this and future reports, as our defense becomes more aggressive. A sad point is that such a vicious attack would not take place in an environment that did not hold contempt in such high regard.

In a lecture at the Harvard Kennedy School in 2017, Arthur Brooks, of the American Enterprise Institute, analyzed the state of public discourse, saying: "We don't have an anger problem in American politics. We have a contempt problem in American politics." Though "Contempt" was not the subject of the lecture, audio engineers chose those comments to feature in a promotional video on Facebook. Within a very short time, the video had received over 12 million views - making Brooks think he might have touched a nerve.¹

In modern American political conversation, it's not persuasive reasoning that tallies up likes and retweets, but the ability to "skewer" or "destroy" an opponent. In everyday life, scoring often matters more than peacemaking, kindness, or forgiveness.

Most of us know what contempt feels like, and the pain it causes. Now ask yourself honestly: Have I ever listened only to an attack? Mocked anyone who believed and acted differently? Brushed off someone trying to warn you of some perceived threat or danger that you didn't believe in? It may be a fleeting emotion you regret later, but how do you feel about it when someone does that to you? Can you draw a line between despising the actions and despising the person?²

This sort of cyber contempt has become such a problem internationally that the United Nations has assigned human rights investigators to comb cyberspace to track how websites can stoke hatred and possible violence as part of expanding forensics into the role of the digital world in modern conflict. The influence of online anger and propaganda has been assessed for nearly a generation and is now part of the routine casework

by security forces around the world. But the UN - whose reports are often crucial for possible international prosecutions - is now trying to catch up after years of relying mostly on firsthand reports from the field.

Rights investigators and monitors have used information from open-source Internet sites - including videos, satellite imagery, and inflammatory posts - to strengthen traditional fact-finding in flash points and the tragic headline stories where cruel words have forced people into suicide or acts of violence against others. And yet the public seems oblivious to the damage that such attacks can cause.

In 2018 the UN dispatched a veteran human rights official to Silicon Valley to build relationships with technology companies. Felim McMahon, who directs the technology and human rights program at the University of California at Berkeley law school's Human Rights Center, described the United Nations' pace of reform as "turning several battleships tied together." The UN human rights office, however, has now realized, "We need to have our small teams, not just in the field, but on the Internet," McMahon said, going on to add, "This is essentially putting the UN at the cutting edge of this investigative opportunity. In terms of arriving at the scene of a crime, they are going to be the first ones there."³

The former commissioner of the UN High Commission for Human Rights, Zeid Ra'ad al-Hussein, ramped up efforts at dialogue with tech companies. Hussein feared that the UN risked becoming irrelevant if it didn't make inroads with global tech giants such as Facebook and Microsoft. The Internet is a "fantastically powerful" tool for "empowering people and enhancing their human rights on the one hand," said Scott Campbell, a longtime officer at the UN commission. "On the other hand, the Internet has been used as a medium through which hate speech can be propagated with previously unthinkable speed and scale...sometimes with absolutely catastrophic effects."⁴

You have only to suffer such an assault once to understand what they are talking about.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit recently ruled that the Sixth Amendment's Confrontation Clause was violated when the Government introduced videotaped deposition testimony introduced videotaped deposition testimony without making a good-faith effort, based on the facts of the case, to secure the witnesses' presence at a trial. It is the law of the

land in America that people get to face their accusers - for a number of good reasons.

In the case at hand, the Government filed a motion to declare the witnesses were "unavailable" and to allow the introduction of their videotaped depositions at trial. The defendant countered with a motion to exclude the depositions on the grounds that the Government had failed to prove the witnesses were unavailable and that the introduction of the videotaped depositions violated his right to confrontation.⁵ As the Supreme Court stated in *United States v. Allie*, 978 F.2d 1401 (5th Cir. 1992): "...[b]ecause of the importance our constitutional tradition attaches to a defendant's right to confrontation, the good-faith effort requirement demands much more than a merely perfunctory effort by the government."

In the past, the public has been protected from such un-Constitutional attacks by the appeal courts for criminal encounters, and by local courts when it came to what most would consider 'slander' or 'false witness' accusations. But because the legal system has not been able to keep up with the technology, we now find fanatics of every sort are able to accost us with any wild accusation or statement that they want, with seemingly no realistic recourse on the part of the victim.

How many children have you heard about over the last few years who have killed themselves after a cyber-bully attack? Nor are well healed adults immune from such reactions to being emotional butchered by such cowardly backstabbing. A well-known, 23-year-old porn star, apparently hung herself in December 2017 after a number of bitter media attacks over something she had said.

My only recourse in my own case seems to be to 'vent' a bit, and try to remind the public of a number of factors that my enemies have overlooked in their rush do harm to my family and myself. I am reminded of actor Jackie Chan's words; "I allowed myself to be bullied because I was scared...I was bullied until I prevented a new student from being bullied. By standing up for him, I learned to stand up for myself."⁶

After 35 years in California prisons, very little scares me, and nobody bullies me. Another point, however, that most of us have heard before, but those of us in prison know often be a false hope, is that "the truth shall set you free." Anyone in prison, or who has suffered a Government or Media attack, will tell you that all too often the 'truth' becomes so twisted by the expert enemy forces that the sure weight of the falsehoods

are going to convict you no matter what the truth might have been. And because in the new 'Media-Rules' society there is no such thing as "You've done your time", or "Give the man another chance," the more a vicious pendant can excite the public 'will', the less chance a man has to ever get out of prison. Because of the timing in my own case - that the attack came shortly after the filing of paperwork requesting a 'commutation' that might have allowed me to start going to a Parole Board with the long range hope of someday going home - my family and I have to consider the possibility that the Government still so fears my whistleblowing efforts that they will go so far as to organize a media attack to further discredit me and rebuild an active 'hate' and 'fear' towards me in the public mind. Why else, after nearly 40 years, would anyone try to dig up such long forgotten stories?

Well, money for one thing. The men involved have been trying to get money from the public for months to supposedly use in making of a more elaborate video against me. One can only guess how much money they've already been given by interested sources that have a stake in trying to silence me. I might remind the public of the words of Ray Bradbury, when he warned that, "There are worse crimes than burning books. One of them is not reading them."

In its landmark ruling in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010) - which held political campaign spending is a form of protected speech - the U.S. Supreme Court noted the First Amendment is "[p]remised on mistrust of governmental power." The Court has also held that such mistrust extends to bans on books and other reading materials, since "freedom of speech is not merely freedom to speak; it is also freedom to read."⁷

In addition to the many other privations prisoners experience, we are often subjected to censorship of books, magazines and even correspondence by prison officials, and everything we attempt to write or say is constantly looked at and often censored. As the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit wrote, "The simple opportunity to read a book or write a letter, whether it expresses political views or absent affections, supplies a vital link between the inmate and the outside world, and nourishes the prisoner's mind despite the blankness and bleakness of his environment."⁸

Yet restrictions on books and magazine have become commonplace in prisons and jails, and now someone is trying to silence my comments on a number of subjects by turning public

6

attention against me - or perhaps even provoking an attack on me in prison to silence me once and for all. It should be noted that the men involved in this 'cyber' attack have already contacted my fellow prisoners in the attempt to make me look bad in their eyes - something that, in prison, can result in very dangerous situations, and leave me in a position where I have no options but to defend myself, and thus ruin any hope there may be for a positive action by the Parole Board.

In 1974, in *Procunier v. Martinez*, 416 U.S. 396 (1974), writing for the majority, Justice Thurgood Marshall stated, "when the prison gates slam behind an inmate, he does not lose his human quality; his mind does not become closed to ideas; his intellect does not cease to feed on a free and open interchange of opinions, his yearning for self-respect does not end; nor is his quest for self-realization concluded. If anything, the needs for identity and self-respect are more compelling in the dehumanizing prison environment."

Crucial to that need for self-improvement is the ability to read and study, to thereby learn new ideas and ways of thinking - and thus behaving. As a result, federal courts have found that incarceration does not automatically deprive prisoners of the First Amendment's protection from policies that abridge the freedom of speech.

And yet, here we are, with some group of cyber bullies, performing a smear campaign, trying to convince the public that you shouldn't pay any attention to what I might say because they want you to believe that I'm a 'bad man'.

Well, let's get something clear: after 35 years on the mainlines of Californian prisons, I am a really bad man. I sure as Hell wouldn't want me for an enemy. But that doesn't mean that you shouldn't listen to my voice when I try to warn you that something is going wrong! I have never spoken or written a word over the last three decades that I didn't expect people to question. I've told the public to question and research everything they are told. What I object to is the current fad of attacking a speaker or writer on a personal level when you can't find a 'real' flaw in their arguments. This becomes no different than the street thug who beats someone into silence just because he is more brutal and can get away with the attack. The sad fact is that the Government, and the NWO backed media, get away with this sort of tactic just about any time they desire. But that doesn't mean that we have to like it, or that we should remain silent when we see it happening yet again! As Americans, it is up to each of us to demand that our rights are

not violated by the Government, or any individual who thinks they are above the laws of our land.

And it is our right, according to our American Constitution, that we can defend ourselves against those who attack us, or pose a threat to our loved ones and our nation. That is why I have started this series of essays, and why events have been set in motion to legally present my side of the story to the public in a rational and organized manner. If my attackers become a little worried about the direction things may take, so be it. How does it feel, punks? You should never have attacked my wife and children in public!

Sad, when a convict is the only one with any class left standing.

Notes:

1. Cheaney, Janie B.; "Heaping doses of contempt" WORLD Magazine, September 15, 2018, page 16.
2. Ibid #1.
3. McLaughlin, Tim; "UN increases monitoring of hate speech on Internet," Washington Post, November 27, 2018.
4. Ibid, #3.
5. Ankney, Douglas; "Fifth Circuit: Introduction of Deposition Video Without Making Good-Faith Effort to Secure Witnesses' Presence at Trial Violates Confrontation Clause," Criminal Legal News (March 2019), p. 29.
6. Quoted in Guideposts, March 2019, page 12.
7. See: *King v. Federal Bureau of Prisons*, 415 F.3d 634 (7th Cir. 2005).
8. See: *Wolfish v. Levi*, 573 F.2d 118 (2d Cir. 1978), rev'd *sum nom. Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520 (1979).



March 17, 2019

Dearest Kerry,

I hope this finds you well, and ready for the joy of a new Easter and Spring. Happy St. Patrick's Day - always the opening door to the new season of fresh air and rebirth and new starts.

I am pleased to send a map of the "Jack and Laura Dangermond Preserve", that we spoke about as the nature area recently given into a 'trust' near Point Conception overlooking the Santa Barbara Channel that provides a new 'safe area' just south of Vandenberg AFB for some of our less average friends. I believe you will find the existence of such a 'park' an interesting addition to the area, although I question how many humans will be allowed to readily use much of the land involved. ***first 4 pages referred to here may refer to the first 4 pages labeled "To Be Attacked by a Cyber-Space Troll. If not, then the pages are missing...

With luck, by now you have received the first four pages of this report on 'false witnesses'. I have chosen to start my "Moore Defense" in this manner because I see his use of the contrived witness list as much more than just a simple attack on myself, or any of us. I see this as another blatant example of the greater powers attack on all whistleblowers, and I believe that by systematically pointing out this concept and how it works the to the 'rational public', I may be able to do some good for all involved - more than just some whining 'poor me' stuff. I hope this meets with your satisfaction, and fits in with the more professional approach that I have come to expect from your own efforts.

I should mention that I see this as only 'part one' of an extensive retort, and a warm up of the direction I intend on taking as we learn more about what Mr. Moore and his cronies are plotting. I have no intention of giving him too much information - or 'direction' - in these early stages. The fact that his efforts seem to have wandered in the first place suggest that the plan has not gone the way he and his backers had hoped. Of course, as our own legal advisors have warned, this also may push him to reach for the wilder false charges and accusations that will be much harder to defend against, as he realizes that there are no 'real' bits of evidence to use against me. What an experience this has been. And it is forcing me to think out, and write about, a number of points that may help others in years to come face similar problems of their own. After all, we are not the first people to face such unfriendly attacks, nor shall we be the last.

Okay, so let me get back to the report at the point where we left off a few days ago...

Network of Protection

The Jack and Laura Dangermond Preserve adds to an already-robust mix of protected lands, marine preserves and no-fishing zones in this part of Southern California. The Nature Conservancy has been working in the region for 40 years.



As we have painfully seen, snitches come in all shapes and sizes, and their various labels come from their position in the grand scheme of the proceedings.

The "jailhouse snitch" is the prototypical incentivized witness who informs law enforcement, prison staff, or the media about what another prisoner has supposedly said or done, usually the result of an overheard conversation or at the snitch's prodding. This type of informant is often involved in many wrongful convictions, or the original crime that set the story in motion. The "accomplice informant" is the codefendant of the person the informant is offering information against in an effort to get his own charges dropped or sentence reduced. These informants are commonly used by law enforcement and the media to ensnare others in the supposed scheme, especially the bigger fish.

Interestingly, the Department of Justice does not consider accomplice witnesses as "confidential informants" to which rules governing protection and payments apply. Instead, the government considers these informants "cooperating defendant/witnesses" who have an expectation of a reward for their services. Confidential informants, unlike accomplice witnesses, also do not testify in court in order to protect their identity in future cases.

The "calumniator" has traits of the other types of informants but is distinguished by the desire to shift as much blame as possible onto someone else in order to escape liability. It is not uncommon for the calumniator to place blame on an innocent person, which has resulted in many wrongful convictions, not to mention many innocent people ruined by the media that often promotes such calumniators.

Snitches are the leading cause of wrongful convictions in the United States, particularly in capital cases, according to a 2004 Northwest University study.³ Researchers in that study discovered that nearly half of the exonerations involved convictions that were based on snitches. Over 100 of those exonerations were for prisoners on death row. Study after study have shown wrongful convictions based on incentivized witnesses is a real problem worth investigation, while the growing problem of innocent people being ruined by the rumor-mill of cyber-space is becoming an epidemic.

Again, one should remember what U.S. Court of Appeals judge Stephen Trott said in his 1996 commentary on incentivized witnesses titled Words of Warning for Prosecutors Using

additional 2 pages missing here...Page 3 & 4

Criminals as Witnesses: "Criminals are likely to say and do almost anything to get what they want, especially when what they want is to get out of trouble with the law," Not only do incentivized witnesses have the ability to fabricate evidence, they can do so without sparking much suspicion because they know the information they provide is difficult to corroborate or to defend against. Incentivized witnesses can manipulate their version of the facts precisely because they know which facts are verifiable and which are not. The lies by the incentivized witness are difficult to detect, and the listener may infer from the details provided by the witness that the facts are indeed true. And who would know? The prosecutor or media-type wants to believe the witness, and the defense attorney does not believe him but cannot prove he is lying.

There also is little to no oversight of a prosecutor or media reporter using an incentivized witness. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that prosecutors have "broad" power to administer criminal justice and prosecute (or not) however they see fit. Retired U.S. District Court judge John Gleeson remarked that "judges are in fact not well suited to supervise criminal investigations, a process which is generally best left to the executive branch." This leaves the prosecutors themselves to oversee their use of incentivized witnesses, a plan not without its obvious weaknesses. There is no watchdog group or authority to keep an eye on the media's use of such people. Because an offer of leniency from the prosecutor - often with the help of a media pendant working with the government - the situation offers a powerful incentive to lie.

A 2014 Northwestern University study found that almost half of the wrongful convictions in death penalty cases were based on false testimony of incentivized witnesses, making snitches the leading cause of wrongful convictions in capital cases. By 2016, the National Registry of Exonerations found that 81 of 116 death penalty exonerations involved perjury or false testimony by incentivized witnesses, an increase up to 70 percent. Barry Scheck's Innocence Project found that 25 percent of DNA exonerations involved the knowing use of false incentivized witness testimony, and 11 percent involved the use of coerced witness testimony.⁴

Families Against Mandatory Minimums noted in 2010 that the threat of mandatory minimum sentences coerced 25 percent of defendants to cooperate with law enforcement in hopes of persuading the government to file a motion for a sentence below the mandatory minimum, since only a motion by the government can get around a mandatory minimum sentence.⁵

The facts show that numerous studies have been conducted on incentivized witnesses, including their effect on wrongful convictions, why they decide to cooperate with the government or other authority figures, and what it takes to persuade someone to become an incentivized witness. While these studies went about their findings in various ways, they all came to the same conclusion: offered an incentive to do so, most people, even honest people, will lie in exchange for some benefit.

In a 2017 study led by University of Arizona law professor Christopher Robertson, two experiments conducted on hundreds of people showed that 20 percent of one group would lie as a witness for the government in a case against someone else to obtain leniency for an unrelated offense, and 55 percent in another study group would lie against one of their codefendants in order to get leniency. The vignette based experiments conducted by Robertson and his colleagues showed that non-criminals elected to lie at a rate shockingly higher than one might have expected. At the same time, they recognized that their experiments actually underestimated the rate jailhouse informants would testify falsely for the government. They based this conclusion on the fact that jailhouse informants would be even more inclined to lie than the average person - because that is what criminals do, they said.⁶

Researchers at the University of Arkansas in 2009 found that an offer to students to get out of having to complete another assignment resulted in about one-third of them providing false testimony against someone, even when they were told that the person had not committed the offense. The researchers said this result was not surprising since incentive is a "selfish motivation."⁷

Added to the legal threat of such testimony, one now is faced with the new threat of the widespread use of social media to conduct unregulated, warrantless, long-term surveillance and openly aggressive destruction of individuals by the state or other special interest groups. Government agents have created Facebook accounts with false identities to follow targeted individuals without consideration for any clear investigative outcome, or brought corrupt media pendant-types onboard to discredit (or push people into suicide) targets the State seeks to ruin. How do you fight the false accusations of a cyber-bully, who can report any lie from any supposed 'witness', or make up anything they want to support their side of a story?

That problem is exactly why, in the prison-systems around the United States over the last century, snitches have been

treated harshly by their fellow convicts. For decades, when a man is found to be a 'snitch' or 'rat' in any of the 'mainline' prisons in California, if he doesn't 'lock it up' and go into protective custody, he is likely going to get killed. Such men are considered the lowest of the low, and a threat to all of their convict brothers.

So why would the government risk such a controversial ploy, considering the risk involved? In my own case the answer is fairly simple. There was no evidence that would have done me enough significant legal damage to put me in prison without the use of 'false' or incentivized witnesses. And now, when there was the slight chance that through a 'commutation', I might have hoped to have the 'Life-Without' sentence reduced to a 'Life-With', so that I might seek parole at some point, those who seek to keep me in prison forever are more than willing to utilize the use of such people to get enough negative public reaction so that neither a Governor nor a Judge would dare to sign any such commutation order.

The roots of such an attack can be insidious. In my case, any encounter with entities known to be of extraterrestrial origin is to be considered to be a matter of the highest national security and therefore classified ABOVE TOP SECRET. Under no circumstances is the general public or the public press to learn of the existence of these entities, or their interactions with humans. The official government policy is that such creatures do not exist, and that no agency of the Federal Government is now engaged in any study of extraterrestrials or their artifacts, or in any sort of communications with such creatures. Any deviation from this stated policy is absolutely forbidden.⁸

The penalties for disclosing classified information concerning extraterrestrials are quite severe. In December 1953, the Joint Chiefs of Staff issued Army-Navy-Air Force publication 146 that made the unauthorized release of information concerning UFOs a crime under the Espionage Act, punishable by up to 10 years in prison and a \$10,000 fine.⁹ According to Robert Dean, this penalty is what prevented most former members of the military from coming forward to disclose information.¹⁰

The strategies for dealing with those former servicemen, corporate employees or witnesses brave (or foolish) enough to come forward to reveal classified information is to intimidate, silence, eliminate or discredit these individuals. This policy involves such strategies as removing all public records of

former military service personal or corporate employees, forcing individuals to make retractions, deliberately distorting statements or existing records of individuals, or discrediting the individuals by twisting the truth or making wild accusations. Bob Lazar, for example, claimed to be a former physicist employed with reverse engineering extraterrestrial craft. He described the disappearance of all his university and public records indicating how intelligence agencies actively discredit whistleblowers.¹¹ In the well-known witness cases in the field - such as Cooper, Schneider, Lear, Wolf, and myself to name but a few - all have been subjected to some or all of these strategies thereby making it difficult for the public to reach firm conclusions about our testimonies. Since the creation of controversy, uncertainty, and confusion is the modus operandi of intelligence agencies in maintaining secrecy of the extraterrestrial presence, then the testimonies of former officials/employees/witnesses need to be considered on their merits.¹²

While issues of credibility, credentials, and disinformation are important in the study of the extraterrestrial presence, a rigorous methodology for dealing with the efforts of intelligence agencies to discredit, intimidate or create controversy around particular witnesses, has yet to be developed. For example, numerous efforts to discredit Cooper in particular by referring to inconsistencies in his statements, retractions, egregious behavior and stated positions. May be due in part or in whole to the policy of intelligence officials to discredit and/or intimidate Cooper from leaking classified information concerning events that he had witnessed in his official capacities. Since Cooper's military record does indicate he did serve in an official capacity on the briefing team of the Commander of the Pacific Fleet, it is most likely that much of his testimony is credible. Whatever inaccuracies exist in terms of his recollections of events (like the timing of meetings between the Eisenhower administration and extraterrestrials), may either have been due to understandable memory lapses after the passage of decades, or perhaps deliberately introduced as a self-protective mechanism. It has been pointed out by some 'whistleblowers' that making retractions or sowing inaccuracies in testimonies is sometimes essential in disseminating information without being physically harmed.¹³ The controversial Cooper has been subjected to undoubtedly the longest and most intense intelligence efforts to discredit or intimidate any whistleblower revealing classified information; finally including his murder by Federal agents.

What I find fascinating is the way the intensity of the attacks of disinformation and discrediting increase as a person brings more information to the public. If we were crazy fringe lunatics, as some would suggest, then why not just leave us alone and let time silence our foolishness? The very vehemence of our attackers would seem to suggest that there is something to what we are trying to tell the public.

Thusly, I consider it something of a compliment and a verification that my efforts in the field have been on the right track. Are the accusations painful and hard to take without reacting? Of course they are. Having my wife accosted in public lectures by some crazed English pervert in bad makeup to disguise himself from the authorities is not something that I am happy about. Having a small number of people from my past come forward to slander and parrot what the NWO-backed Fake News slime suggests irritates but (like the people themselves) is almost meaningless. My greatest problem in fact is trying to keep a number of my 'friends' from protectively over-reacting to the attacks, and thus getting me in more legal trouble for innocent guilt by association. As one snarled recently: "Let's offer them full disclosure. They may not like our version of it, but they so richly deserve it."

More in the next communication.

All my best;

Mark Richards

Footnotes on next page.

Notes:

1. Quoted by Dale Chappell, in "Government Snitches", Criminal Legal News, March 2019, page 1.
2. Ibid #1, page 3.
3. Cassidy, Michael R.; "Soft Words of Hope, Giglio, Accomplice Witnesses, and the Problem of Implied Inducements," NorthWest Univ. Law Review 98, @2003.
4. "The Snitch System," NW Univ. School of Law Center on Wrongful Convictions; "Incentives, Lies, and Disclosure," by Christopher T. Robertson and D. Alex Winkelman, Univ. of Penn. Journal of Constitutional Law 20 (2017).
5. "Understanding Snitching" by Families Against Mandatory Minimums.
6. Norris, Robert J., et al; "'Than That One Innocent Suffer' Evaluating State Safeguards Against Wrongful Convictions", Albany Law Review (2011); and Illinois Compiled Statues 5/115-21 (2003).
7. Bliss, Kevin; "Police Use of 'Undercover Friending' Investigative Technique Unregulated", from **theroot.com**.
8. Majesting 12 Group; "Special Operations Manual, SOM1-01 - Extraterrestrial Entities and Technology, Recovery and Disposal," April 1954, Part 2; http://209.132.68.98/pdf/-som101_part2.pdf.
9. 21st Century Radio's Hieronimus & Co.; "Transcript of Interview with Bob Dean; March 24, 1996", found at site: <http://www.planetarymysteries.com/hieronimus/bobdean.html>
10. Ibid #9.
11. "Bob Lazar on the Billy Goodman Happening"; December 20, 1989; <http://www.swahome.de/lazar3.htm>
12. Salla, Michael; "Eisenhower's 1954 Meeting with Extraterrestrials - Part 2/2, May 22, 2011 by Steve Beckow; <http://goldenageofgaia.com>
13. Salla, Michael; "Disinformation, Extraterrestrial Subversion & Psychological Reductionism - A Reply to Dr. Richard Boylan," www.exopolitics.org January 7, 2004, found on <http://exopolitics.org/Exo-Comment-11.htm>
- 14.